SRC-05-19-94-M

SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

MINUTES

Meeting of Thursday, May 19, 1994
Room BC-110, 10:00

Present: E. Abouheif, E.M. Besso, P. Bird, **T. Bui (Chair)**, A.B. Ibrahim, P. Lightbown, K. Lipke, E. Loo (recording secretary), D. Markiewicz, P. Shizgal, C. Suen, K. Thulasiraman

Guest: Dr. Frederic Bird

Regrets: S. Ali, U. de Brentani

Absent: A. Homzy, J.F. Plamondon

DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED AND DISTRIBUTED TO SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

In Advance

SRC-05-19-94-A	Draft Agenda for the SRC Meeting of May 19, 1994
SRC-05-05-95-M	Minutes for the SRC Meeting of May 5, 1994
SRC-05-19-94-D1	Discussion Paper: Long-Term Development Plan (May 1994)
SRC-05-19-94-D2a	Development of the profile for Vice-Rector, Academic
SRC-05-19-94-D2b	The mandate of the Rector and Vice-Chancellor (Revised in October 1988).
SRC-05-19-94-D2c	Cumulative profile of the next Dean of the Faculty of Commerce and Administration (October 25, 1991).
SRC-05-19-94-D2d	Cumulative profile of the next Dean of the Faculty of Engineering & Computer Science (December 1992).
SRC-05-19-94-D3	Report of the Faculty Research Development Programme Evaluation Committee
SRC-05-19-94-D4a	Concordia University Code of Ethics: Guidelines for Ethical Actions
SRC-05-19-94-D4b	Concordia University Code of Ethics: Guidelines for Ethical Actions - Corrections and additions to the codes
SRC-05-19-94-D4c	Recommendations from the Consultative Committee on a Proposed University Code of Ethics
SRC-05-19-94-D4d	Confidential Disclosure Form and Annual Disclosure Form
SRC-03-17-94-D3	Report of the Expert Task Force on the Enhancement of University-Wide Research Support Services and Facilities. (Revised on May 5, 1994)

DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED AND DISTRIBUTED TO SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

At the Meeting

SRC-05-19-94-D4 Concordia University Code of Ethics: Guidelines for Ethical Actions (Draft #4, May 17, 1994).

SRC-05-19-94-D2 Memo dated May 18, 1994 from Dr. T. Bui to B. Gaudet, re: Profiles for the upcoming Advisory Search Committees for the four senior positions: Rector and Vice-Chancellor, Vice-Rector, Academic, Dean of the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science, and Dean of the Faculty of Commerce and Administration.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m.

1. Approval of Agenda (SRC-05-19-94-A)

The agenda for the meeting was approved.

2. Approval of Minutes from the meeting of March 17, 1994.

The Minutes for the May, 5th meeting was approved following the following amendments:

- Page 3, section 5, paragraph 3 "President of FCAR addressed a group of people and confirmed that the applications for research centres should definitely be submitted in French, with the English version accompanying it, if available". This only regards centre applications, however, they appreciate translations for the other FCAR applications.

- Page 3, section 5, paragraph 4 "Claude Corbo, Rector ... Funding".

3. Business arising from Minutes

Report of the Expert Task Force on the Enhancement of University-Wide Research Support Services and Facilities.

Suggestions were made to revise:

a) the recommendation on Recognition of Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity and the recommendation on Computing Services, and

b) the structure of the Report in terms of different categories. P. Lightbown will prepare the final version of the Report with the help of other members of the Committee.

4. Report of the Chair

None.

5. Report of the Director, Office of Research Services

E.M. Besso reported the following:

- She is in the process of selecting individuals who have not been awarded because of insufficient funds but are ranked reasonably high, i.e. those who have received SSHRC "4A" designates. They will be given Bridge Funding and the award will be announced by the end of next week.

- In collaboration with University Advancement and Public Relations, the Office of Research Services is putting together a research brochure. There is a freelance writer working on the topics, the priorities with the input of the associates and vice deans have been communicated. The expected date of completion for the writing is by the end of Summer 1994. It will be about 12 to 16 pages and should be sent out by December.

6. Question Period

None.

7 a) Review Report of the Faculty Research Development Programme

Chair noted that in the Senate document regarding FRDP, there is a requirement that in the fourth year, SRC will review the programme and make recommendations to Senate. At the beginning of this year E.M. Besso was appointed Chair of the FRDP Evaluation Committee. The membership of this Committee includes four associate deans, representing each of the four faculties.

E.M. Besso briefly reported that this document is the fruit of different participation. The committee strongly recommends that the internal funding programme should be continued but with modifications which are indicated in the set of recommendations at the end with the need to identify the modalities and the amount to be ascribed to each and that a task force be appointed immediately to develop guidelines and procedures for the distribution of the FRDP funds among the four recommended programme elements: start-up, research re-entry, emerging teams and bridge funding.

C. Suen asked whether it would be appropriate to add a category to support research centres.

7 **a) Review Report of the Faculty Research Development Programme**

E.M. Besso remarked that the members of the FRDP Evaluation Committee are conscious that there is a limited amount of funding. They have looked at the concept of how the monies are being used to reach the stage to-day where they are able to say that it has been a strong success in terms of supporting Start-up. They have put a recommendation to ensure that at least the FRDP is continued at this particular level. In broad form, the Committee touched on the need to encourage the development of centres but from the prospective of strengthening the nucleus that can develop into a centre and this is discussed at the end of the final section and emerges the recommendation to support the teams which will be able to successfully thrive for infrastructure support from the outside. It was not discussed to put an item on the support of existing research centres in the course of these deliberations.

Upon motion duly moved and seconded, it was unanimously approved:

THAT the Report of the FRDP Evaluation Committee be approved.

Chair thanked the Committee and E.M. Besso for their work.

7 **b) Long-term development plan**

Chair remarked that this item should be tabled to the next SRC meeting in the Fall.

7 **c) Profiles of the Senior Administrators (SRC-05-19-94-D2, 05-19-94-D2a, 05-19-94-D2b, 05-19-94-D2c, 05-19-94-D2d)**

Chair remarked that document SRC-05-19-94-D2 is a copy of his memo which was sent at 5 p.m. yesterday to Me. Gaudet. When he received the two memos from Me. Gaudet, he thought that he had until to-morrow to send in his comments. When he heard that there would be a meeting of the Rector and the Deans this morning to revise the four profiles, he has drafted a response on behalf of the Committee. He asked Committee Members whether they have further input, if so, he can find means to convey their comments to the Committee.

7 **d) Review of Research Centres progress reports**

Chair noted that as per Article IV of the Senate document **Guidelines for Senate Evaluation of Research Centres** (US-89-2-D4). He has asked directors of seven research centres to submit a five-year progress report. The reports were sent to the respective faculty councils and they will be forwarded to the SRC. He asked committee members if they have any suggestions on how these reports should be dealt with?

P. Bird said that he has looked at the CRDH report which consists of the most recent proposal to FCAR and five annual reports. He made a copy of part of the proposals, the description of the research itself and sent to members of the Faculty Council informing them that a copy of the whole report is available in his office.

7 d) Review of Research Centres progress reports

P. Shizgal pointed out that there is, in various documents coming from this Committee, a need for ongoing support of research centres, infrastructure, special needs of the centres, and for resources, hence it makes sense that the community has some understanding of what is produced by the centres. He suggested that a brief summary should be given to Senate.

E.M. Besso said that in terms of the ability to evaluate or to compare to some extent comment, she has noticed from the few requests that she has seen regarding centres that there is a tendency, which is reasonable, to provide the information in the form of recent applications. In such cases, when supplemented with large faculty material, this precludes the ability to do a communication transfer. What she suggests is that in fact we do not have an embryonic format but essentially to select a list of criteria that each of the submissions will be looked at in light of. On an information basis communicate this on a 1 or 2 page format to Senate because they probably do not have more time than we do and that where we potentially can expect problem areas and not to say a centre is judged excellent or poor on the criteria but what are the areas that we are looking at in those annual reports.

7 e) Proposed Code of Ethics

Chair thanked Dr. Frederick Bird, Chair of the Code of Ethics Committee for coming to the SRC meeting. Dr. Bird informed Committee Members that the mandate of the Code of Ethics Committee is to consult with the university community and come up with the recommendations and changes to the document prepared by the University legal counsel Me Bram Freedman. The Committee actually did more than that. The Code of Ethics Committee has met a number of times and decided that the work of the committee be done in two phases, first the Committee studied all documents as well as the consultation document and met with various people in the University. The Committee then developed the first draft of the code. This draft was then circulated to selective groups such as Deans, SRC, Standing Committee of Senate for input. As a result of the initial consultations, the Committee, with the help of Me. Freedman, revised the document. The Committee sends the revised document to a wider audience and a public hearing will be held over two days in June for further consultations.

P. Shizgal said that he is very happy to see that the document is written to address the university community at large. It has achieved its purposes very well, it is very clear, very well written and very important for academic issues.

P. Bird said that he supports what P. Shizgal has said, having sat on the CUFA joint grievance committee for years, reading this document is refreshing, it allows us opinion and discretionary attitude.

8. Varia

9. Adjournment

It was moved that the meeting be adjourned at 1:25 p.m.